

burden on the Examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP §803.02, §806.04(a)- §806.04(i), §808.01(a) and §808.02). The Examiner has not set forth why there would be a serious burden if restriction is required.

III. Conclusion

Upon review of references involved in this field of technology, when considering that the method recited by the Group II claims is directed to a method of manufacturing a cap assembly, and elected claims 1-14 are directed to cap assembly and a secondary battery, and when all of the other various facts are taken into consideration, it is believed that upon reconsideration of the Examiner's initial restriction requirement, all of the pending claims should be examined in the subject application.

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our deposit account number. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 7/19/06

By:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Howard I. Levy  
Registration No. 55,378

1400 Eye St., NW, Ste 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 216-9505  
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510